



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,981	10/23/2000	Heikki Niskanen	990 1240	9062

21831 7590 02/10/2004

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.
1140 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, 15th FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036-5803

EXAMINER

KIM, SANG K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3654

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/673,981

Applicant(s)

NISKANEN, HEIKKI

Examiner

SANG KIM

Art Unit

3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are rejected because they are replete with indefiniteness, double inclusions, elements lacking antecedent basis, and typographical errors.

In claims 1, 6, and 13, the phrase, "a substantially spiral-shaped groove pattern has been formed between the multiple deep guide grooves, and which extends across the axial width of the roll mantle" is indefinite and vague. Examiner cannot determine which grooves or groove is/are extended across the axial width of the roll mantle.

For example, claim 1 recites the limitation "the mantle" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Applicant is advised to check throughout the claims for proper antecedent basis for all recited elements.

For example, claim 2 recites, "a first winding drum (11) and a second winding drum arrangement (12), which consists of a first belt roll (13), of a second belt roll (14), and of adjacent endless belts (15) fitted around said belt rolls", is indefinite and vague. These elements have already been mentioned in the previous claim. Applicant is advised to check throughout the claims, since claims are replete with double inclusions.

Art Unit: 3654

In claim 2, line 1, insert a space in between "claim 1wherein". Applicant is advised to check throughout the claims, since claims are replete with typographical errors.

Claim 2 is vague and indefinite because it is redundant with respect to the previous claim. It is unclear how it further limits the scope of the claim from which it depends.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 6, and 13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 2-5, and 7-12, and 14-19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following claim 1 drafted by the examiner and considered to distinguish patentably over the art of record in this application, is presented to applicant for consideration:

--1. A reel-up/winder, comprising at least one support member (11, 12; 30...34) that support the reel/roll (10) to be formed onto a reel/roll spool (16), of which at least one of said support member has a set of belt rolls (12:30...34), which consists of a belt loop (15,34) and supported by means of at least two rolls (13,14;30,31), whose axes are substantially parallel to the axis of the reel/roll spool (16), wherein into the outer face of a mantle of at least one roll (13, 14;30,31) which is in nip contact with the reel/roll (10) to

Art Unit: 3654

be formed in said set of belt rolls (12;30...34), a substantially spiral-shaped groove pattern (204) is formed between multiple deep guide grooves (203) which are formed in the mantle and which are spaced across the axial length of the roll mantle--.

Applicant is advised to rewrite the remaining claims consistent with claim 1 above, to correct the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-9, filed 11/17/03, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-19 under Kinnunen et al in view of Heymanns have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

The limitation added to claim 1, reciting a substantially spiral-shaped groove pattern has been formed between the multiple deep guide grooves, necessitated the new ground of rejection(s) set forth above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sang Kim whose telephone number is (703) 305-3712. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. alternating Friday.

Art Unit: 3654

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (703) 308-2688. The fax phone numbers are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

SK

2/3/04


KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600